

PAUL FREEDMAN

*ANOTHER LOOK AT THE UPRISING OF THE TOWNSMEN OF VIC
(1181-1183)*

This article, an inadequate but heartfelt tribute to Manuel Riu, revisits an incident in the history of the city of Vic that I wrote about at the beginning of my academic career.² In returning to the attempt of leading townsmen of Vic in the late-twelfth century to defy the bishop's jurisdiction I am reminded of the kindness and encouragement received from Professor Riu more than twenty years ago and throughout all the intervening period.

Between 1205 and 1211 Guillem de Montcada and Bishop Guillem de Taverdet engaged in a ferocious struggle concerning jurisdiction over the city of Vic. The bishop excommunicated Guillem de Montcada and appealed to the archbishop of Tarragona (with only indifferent success), denouncing in bitter terms the devastation wreaked by his opponent in violently furthering his claims.³

The Montcada and their predecessors (the viscounts of Ausona and the seneschals of the count of Barcelona) controlled the upper part of the town, site of the original Roman settlement, but the bishop asserted ultimate jurisdiction. From the late ninth century, when Roman Ausona was restored, the lords of the upper town and its castle were content to wrest concessions from the bishops over markets, coi-

1. I am very grateful to Josep Masnou of Manresa who is completing a thesis on the corporate life of the cathedral of Vic, "La vida canonical a la catedral de Vic (886-1230)." In the course of his important research he was kind enough to point out to me the document from the Vic archives on which this article is based. I would also like to thank Robert Babcock, Curator of Early Books and Manuscripts at the Beinecke Library, Yale University, for his help in accurately reading, transcribing and understanding this document.

2. Paul Freedman, "An Unsuccessful Attempt at Urban Organization in Twelfth-Century Catalonia," *Speculum* 54 (1979), 479-491. A shorter version was translated into Catalan by Immaculada Ollich i Castanyer under the title "Un règim consular en el Vic del segle XII," *Ausa* 9 (1980), 1-6.

3. Discussed by John C. Shideler, "Les tactiques politiques des Montcada seigneurs de Vic du début du XIIIe siècle," *Ausa* 9 (1981), 329-342.

nage and other sources of revenue without directly confronting the bishop's authority.⁴

In the early thirteenth century, however, Guillem de Montcada claimed to be the co-seigneur of the city and refused to recognize any form of episcopal overlordship. After 1211 the violence died down but only in 1224 was an accord reached by which Guillem de Montcada renounced claims to a portion of the revenue in the market of the episcopal half of the city in return for concessions over coinage and mustering of the men of Vic for war. Above all, the bishop was forced to give up judicial authority over the Montcada sector, effectively recognizing the division of the town into two separate jurisdictions.⁵ This did not end in any permanent fashion the tensions between the bishops and the Montcada, but it marks a key moment in the decline of the secular lordship of the bishop of Vic.⁶

In the course of various attempts to adjudicate the controversy, the testimony of elderly notables was solicited with regard to how the bishop's jurisdiction had been recognized or circumvented in the past. Almost twenty years ago John Shideler edited the testimony given in this controversy by the canon Pere de Taverter, sacristan from 1184 until his death in 1218. Pere was the uncle of Bishop Guillem de Taverter (whose turbulent pontificate lasted from 1195 to 1233) and his memory extended back fifty years to recall executions, mutilations, fines and other penalties imposed by the bishops and their representatives in the exercise of high and low justice.⁷ Pere de Taverter also described how malefactors had been handed over to the episcopal tribunals by the Montcada and their servants and even in one instance by King Alfons when a false measure was detected in the sale of wine.

As a result of reordering the incomparably rich Vic archives, some two hundred previously unknown documents, mostly from the eleventh and twelfth centuries, have been added to the main series of capitular records, Calaix 6. Among them is a parchment containing the statements of two other witnesses in the Montcada dispute drawn up on September 6, 1209, the same day that Pere de Taverter's account was recorded. This document, ACV c. 6, 2875, thus forms a companion to the text edited by Shideler and expands our knowledge of the claims and counter-claims made early in the conflict. Reference is made in c. 6, 2875 to the testimony of Pere

4. Paul Freedman, *The Diocese of Vic: Tradition and Regeneration in Medieval Catalonia* (New Brunswick, 1983), pp. 68-89 (= *Tradició i regeneració a la Catalunya medieval*, trans. Monsterrat Pagès [Barcelona, 1985], pp. 112-146).

5. Shideler, "Les tactiques," pp. 333-334.

6. For conflicts after 1224 see Joseph Gudiol y Cunill, "Les bregues sobre lo senyoríu de Vich en el temps del rey Jaume I," in *Congrès d'història de la Corona d'Aragó (Barcelona, 1909)* vol. 1 (Barcelona, 1913), 194-218.

7. Shideler, "Les tactiques," appendix no. 2, pp. 338-341 transcribing Arxiu Capitular de Vic (=ACV), calaix 6, Episcopologi I, 83 (September 6, 1209).

de Taveret so that the witnesses interviewed in this document must have given their statements after that of the sacristan.⁸ The document as it survives starts in the middle of an account given by a person who, in the absence of the beginning of his questioning, cannot be identified. It continues with the sworn testimony of a cleric of Vic, here named only as "*P. capellanus Uici*," concerning the bishop's exercise of control over market weights and measures and the punishment of crimes (in one instance by the amputation of a foot and in another the gouging out of eyes). This witness can be identified as Pere, priest of the church of Santa Maria la Rodona, the round church that once stood in front of the cathedral and served the parochial needs of the city and known in the medieval period as the *capellanus Uici*. "Petrus capellanus" was among the witnesses to a donation of an endowment made in 1210 for a celebration of St. Augustine's feast day made in by the sacristan Pere de Taveret.⁹ He was more often known as "Petrus Petragoricus" and served as a cathedral canon.¹⁰

Pere also, incidentally, offered information about an episode of the late twelfth century otherwise known only through an undated record in the Arxiu de la Corona d'Aragó in which townsmen of Vic attempted to establish a form of self-government in defiance of Bishop Pere de Redorta.¹¹ Pere recalled the swearing of mutual oaths by the townsmen, the opposition of the bishop, their attempts to enlist the aid of the king, and the suppression of their conspiracy. In the context of the Montcada controversy, his recollection of the townsmen's movement was relevant only because it showed that in a previous jurisdictional crisis the Montcadas had played no role; the men of Vic treated with the bishop and the king (*interrogatus si fuit uocatus ad hoc in aliquo G. R. uel baiulus suus, dixit non.*)

As it was not the point of his testimony Pere gave only a brief account of the townsmen's movement, but because our previous information was based solely on the decision rendered by a tribunal at the end of the affair, his statement is useful especially in providing a narrative context, identifying some of the protagonists and showing the extent of royal intervention.

Let us start with the judges' findings which describe the events in terms of the swearing of mutual oaths by the townsmen and an attempt to elect what the judges refer to as "consuls" to rule the city in defiance of the bishop. The judges were Arnau de Darnius, sacristan of Girona, and three canons of the cathedral of Vic

8. Reference is also made to testimony previously given by "B. claviger Sancti Petri".

9. ACV, calaix 7, perg. s/n (22 October, 1210), ed. Josep Masnou, "El manteniment del culte a la catedral de Vic al segle XIII," *Miscel·lània litúrgica catalana* 8 (1997), 172-173.

10. I am grateful to Josep Masnou for this identification. Petrus Petragoricus signed documents in 1194 (ACV, c. 6, Episcopologi I, 55) and 1202 (c. 6, 1879).

11. ACA, Cancelleria, Extraintentari 3146. The incident is described in Freedman, "An Unsuccessful Attempt at Urban Organization."

including, interestingly enough, "P. de Taverteto." The latter, the one judge who did not sign the document, is plausibly the later sacristan and, if so, it is a pity his recollection of the incident was not sought in the course of his testimony in 1209 (or that we no longer have it if it was).

The tribunal heard three related complaints from the bishop: that the townsmen had sworn mutual oaths (*sese coniurauerant*) without his consent, that they had elected representatives (*consules*), and attempted to set up their own government. All this was in defiance of the episcopal lordship of the town which the bishop traced back to royal (i.e. Frankish) authority. The bishop was particularly incensed that after his express prohibition some of the conspirators had persisted in their oaths. The men responded by admitting that they swore oaths of mutual defense, but claimed this was done not to defy the bishop but to protect themselves from damages inflicted by persons from outside the town. They denied that they had maintained their claims to organize themselves after the bishop forbade them to continue.

The judges' findings were erudite, harsh in tone, but finally rather lenient. One of the striking aspects of this document is its ostentatious display of Roman legal learning in terms derived, as André Gouron has shown, from the *Summa Trecensis*, a commentary on the Justinianic corpus written in Provence.¹² The judges accused the townsmen of usurping public authority, of nearing if not actually arriving at committing *lèse majesté*, of lacking deference to their episcopal lord in a manner resembling the ingratitude of Roman freemen toward their patrons which the law punished with servitude. Moreover, if the (Roman) law required exile and confiscation for the formation of conspiracies merely to create economic monopolies, how much the more severely then did this subversive association merit suppression. After such an indignant disquisition the actual sentence was rather an anti-climax: the men were to swear that after the bishop's prohibition they had not persisted in their rebellious conspiracy.

Pere *capellanus* describes, albeit in outline, a more specific series of events. The "greater part" of the men of Vic swore oaths of mutual aid (*fecerunt coniurationem inter se, uero se adinuicem iuuarent atque defenderent*). Nowhere in this document does the term *consules* appear. This classicizing word may be more an example of the judges' legal learning than a formulation thought up by the townsmen. On the other hand, an argument from silence based on testimony more than twenty years

12. André Gouron, "L'auteur et la patrie de la *Summa Trecensis*," *Ius commune* 12 (1984), 1-38; idem, "Aux origines de l'influence des glossateurs en Espagne," *Historia, Instituciones, Documentos* 10 (1983), 325-246; idem, "L'élaboration de la *Summa Trecensis*," in *Sodalitas: Scritti in onore di Antonio Guarino* vol.8 (Naples, 1984), 3861-3696. These are reprinted in a collection of Gouron's articles entitled *Études sur la diffusion des doctrines juridiques médiévales* (Aldershot, 1987).

distant from the events is hardly decisive. Oaths of mutual defence sworn by townsmen *were* accompanied by the election of *consules* at Cervera (1182 and 1202), Lleida (1197), and Perpignan (1197), so the word was hardly unknown.¹³ As Gouron has shown, Roman law spread with the progress of urban movements in the twelfth-century Mediterranean, but at Vic it was probably the judges (and perhaps the bishop) rather than the townsmen who shaped the mutual oaths into a pattern suggested by Roman legal terminology.¹⁴

The more general word *coniuratio* is itself not very common in Catalan sources, but the term had European-wide use to describe a multiplicity of popular movements to demand and protect the perceived rights of both urban and rural communities.¹⁵ *Coniuratio* appears in both the decision of the judges and the recollections of the priest Pere.

Unfortunately our witness was even less precise than the judicial tribunal about the motives for forming this particular *coniuratio*. At the hearing the bishop complained that the townsmen refused to pay the judicial levies (*firmançiae*) which indicated jurisdictional subordination and were presumably felt to be a degrading guarantee of compliance with what the episcopal court ordered. For their part the townsmen lamented the precarious state of civil order in their defense before the tribunal, implying that the bishop had not met his obligation to assure peace. Among the townsmen's transgressions, according to the judges, was establishing private prisons to hold such malefactors as they managed to catch.¹⁶

Pere tells us merely that the men swore to aid and protect each other. He does specify, however, that in making this mutual agreement they exempted the king, the bishop, Guillem Ramon (de Montcada, lord of the upper town) as prospective

13. On the formation of consular regimes in Catalonia see Josep Maria Font Rius, *Orígenes del règimen municipal de Catalunya* (Madrid, 1946), especially pp. 346-376; Max Turull i Rubinat, *La configuració jurídica del municipi baix-medieval: règim municipal i fiscalitat a Cervera entre 1182-1430* (Barcelona, 1990), especially pp. 85-116; Philip Daileader, "The Vanishing Consulates of Catalonia," *Speculum* 74 (1999), 65-94.

14. André Gouron, "Diffusion des consulats méridionaux et expansion du droit romain aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 121 (1963), 26-76.

15. See Otto Gerhard Oexle, "Die Kultur der Rebellion. Schwureinung und Verschwörung im früh- und hochmittelalterlichen Okzident," in *Ordnung und Aufruhr im Mittelalter: Historische und juristische Studien zur Rebellion*, ed. Marie Theres Fögen (Frankfurt am Main, 1995), pp. 119-135; idem, "Gilde und Kommune. Über die Entstehung von 'Einung' und 'Gemeinde' als Grundformen des Zusammenlebens in Europa," in *Theorien kommunaler Ordnung in Europa*, ed. Peter Blickle (Munich, 1996), pp. 75-97.

16. ACA, Canc., Extrains. 3146: "... nam et qui priuati carceris custodiam exercuit tamquam lese maiestatis uiolator ultimo subiugandus est suplitio." This does not quite prove that there really were prisons as the phraseology, another display of legal terminology, is based ultimately on the Digest (48.4.1).

adversaries along with perhaps some few others whom he could no longer recall.¹⁷ The *coniuratio* thus resembled oaths of fidelity between individuals in listing as exceptions those who had some claim to higher jurisdiction. The men of Vic did *not*, however, exempt the clergy of Vic (most significantly the cathedral canons) from their protection agreement and this is presented in Pere's memoir as what provoked the confrontation.

On a Sunday in the cathedral, before the altar of St. Nicholas, Bishop Pere de Redorta enjoined the townsmen to dissolve their oaths. Dressed for the celebration of mass, the bishop appears to have addressed directly certain individuals involved in the oath and certainly named many of them (*expresse nominavit multos ex illis qui erant in sacramentali, iniungens eis. . .*). The bishop warned that if the townsmen refused to abandon their oaths of mutual aid he would consider them traitors to himself and to the Church. The men were not cowed by this threat and took their disobedience further by sending representatives to entreat the aid of King Alfons who was then in Perpignan.

Pere informs us that they obtained the king's endorsement and that he affixed his *signum* to the document recording their sworn association. Only later, when he came to Vic, did King Alfons receive (or at least yield to) the full force of episcopal opposition. The king asked for approval of the provisions of the oath and was angered by the Bishop Pere's categorical refusal. After the production of the written instruments on which episcopal jurisdiction over the town was based, the king changed his mind and dropped his support of the townsmen, clearing the way for the judicial proceedings described in the ACA document, a record that the witness Pere says was still kept at Vic when he testified. He informs us (as the judicial record does not) that the tribunal was appointed by the bishop whose position in the matter was reinforced by the royal change of heart.

In fact the episcopal victory over the townsmen, it is clear from the testimony offered by Pere, was possible only because of royal intervention. Pere echoes the judicial record in obliquely presenting that victory as less than crushing. The men were allowed to assert that they had not continued their defiance beyond the point of the bishop's express prohibition, something both documents make clear was a face-saving rather than strictly accurate statement. According to Pere the men renounced their oaths, but this act was done in a sufficiently discreet way that he himself at least had not witnessed it.

Although the priest of Santa Maria la Rodona could not remember the date beyond the fact that Pere de Redorta was bishop of Vic (he ruled from 1147 to

17. On the Montcada family, its genealogy and relation to the family of the seneschals of the counts of Barcelona, John Shideler, *A Medieval Catalan Noble Family: The Montcadas 1000-1230* (Berkeley, 1983), especially pp. 114-123.

1185), his mention of the king's movements allows a tentative fixing of the date more closely than the period 1175 to 1185 I had earlier suggested.¹⁸ King Alfons was frequently in Perpignan as it lay between his domains in the south of France and his Peninsular realms. He showed up less often in Vic. In September 1182 he was in Perpignan enroute to an extended stay in Provence and Languedoc.¹⁹ In early December of 1183 he was in Vic.²⁰ Pere recalls the interval between the mission to Perpignan and the royal visit to Vic with typical (if understandable) vagueness as encompassing "some little time" (*Et post aliquantulum temporis rex esset apud Vicum*), but a bit over a year is perhaps not too unlikely. At any rate it is the only proximate succession of royal stays in Perpignan and Vic. However, the king was also in Perpignan in March of 1181 on his way to southern France (May and June) and then he appeared in Aragón before July 18, so that it is possible he might have made a now unrecorded stop in Vic between Montpellier (June, 1181) and Gardeny (July 18, 1181).²¹ We can suggest, therefore, a date for the Vic *coniuratio* of between 1181 and 1183.

The priest Pere's not-quite-complete recall of the identity of the delegates to Perpignan is the only evidence for the names of any leaders or representatives of the townsmen. One of the four eluded his memory but he names the other three: P. de Pou, Martí Cuxéta and Berenguer d'Olost. The first of these was a royal bailiff at the time of the incident. As a royal office holder, if a minor one, the bailiff was a logical choice for this embassy. We don't have much other information about him, unfortunately. "P. de Puteo" is mentioned in an undated record from between 1175 and 1180 as the king's bailiff in the neighborhood of Castellolí (in the diocese of Vic but to the west and south, in what is now the comarca of the Anoia).²² Petrus de Puteo witnessed three transactions of the early 1170s, two leases made by clerics of Vic (one by a cathedral canon) and a sale of land.²³ It is likely that this bailiff P. was related to Ramon de Pou who also witnessed two documents,²⁴ but who

18. Freedman, "An Unsuccessful Attempt at Urban Organization," pp. 480-481.

19. Jaime Caruana Gomez, "Itinerario de Alfonso II de Aragón," *Estudios de Edad Media de la Corona de Aragón* 7 (1962), pp. 211-212; Ana Isabel Sánchez Casabón, ed., *Alfonso II Rey de Aragón, Conde de Barcelona y Marqués de Provenza. Documentos (1162-1196)* (Saragossa, 1995), nos. 354 and 355.

20. Cit. Caruana Gomez, "Itinerario," p. 215; Sánchez Casabón, *Alfonso II*, nos. 374-376. Of these three documents the first (a promise of royal protection) is dated December 4, 1183. The other two grant permission to fortify sites and are dated only December 1183.

21. Caruana Gomez, p. 203; Sánchez Casabón, *Alfonso II* nos. 325-328.

22. ACA, Canc., Extraintentari 3148 as noted in Thomas N. Bisson, *Fiscal Accounts of Catalonia under the Early Count-Kings (1151-1213)*, vol. 1 (Berkeley, 1984), p. 270. The dating is according to Prof. Bisson's estimate.

23. ACV c, 6, 2401 (1170); 1738 (1171); 2426 (1175).

24. ACV, Liber Dotationum Antiquarum, ff. 89r-v and another copy f. 152v (1159); c. 6, 2392 (1170). An "Arnaldus de Puteo" witnessed ACV, Liber Dotationum Antiquarum ff. 105r-v (1159).

is best known for his role in the reorganization of the Vic mint in 1174.²⁵ According to a record of 1176 he was in charge of the actual handing out of the shares in the mint's profits with one-half going to the bishop, one-fifth to the lord of the upper town Guillem Ramon de Montcada, and one-tenth each to the sacristan, the viscount of Cardona and Ramon de Pou himself.²⁶

Berenguer d'Olost similarly has some visibility in surviving documentation from the late twelfth century. He witnessed eight transactions between 1172 and 1195, including a lease made to Pere de Tavertet by Pere's relative Pere de Riudeperes, and the donation of a son as a canon by the wealthy townsman Pere Berenguer de Cloquer.²⁷ A likely relative, Ramon d'Olost, appeared as a witness in five records from 1155 to 1175.²⁸ Of Martí Cuxéa I have been unable to find any other traces nor anyone else with this curious last name or sobriquet.

The delegates were not members of the most prominent of the emerging families of the town of Vic— families such as the Cloquer, Coc, Mercadal, Illa— but at least two of them were associated with the urban elite, including the chapter, in a certain number of transactions. Berenguer d'Olost was closely affiliated with the Cloquer family. The role of P. de Pou as both royal bailiff and representative in this affair is suggestive about the significance of office and the constitution of an autonomous urban leadership. Episcopal success in this instance did not disturb in any long-term sense the cohesion of an urban elite that was already visible as early as negotiations over market rights in 1138, and some of whose members would be specifically named as *probi homines* in an agreement of 1198 with Bishop Guillem de Tavertet over the tax on constructing houses in the city.²⁹

25. ACA, Canc. perg. Alfons I, 160, ed. Joaquim Botet y Sisó, *Les monedes catalanes* 1 (Barcelona, 1908), apparatus 16, also in Jaime de Villanueva, *Viage literario a las Iglesias de España* vol. 6 (Valencia, 1821), ap. 1. Discussed in Thomas N. Bisson, *Conservation of Coinage: Monetary Exploitation and Its Restraint in France, Catalonia, and Aragon (c. A.D. 1000-c. 1225)* (Oxford, 1979), p. 79. Pere de Tavertet, then a canon but not yet sacristan, was involved in this transaction as well.

26. ACA, Canc. perg. Alfons I, 194, ed. Botet y Sisó, *Les monedes* 1, ap. 15 and described in Bisson, *Conservation of Coinage*, pp. 78-80.

27. ACV c. 6, 1758 (1176) is the lease agreement; c. 6, 2439 (1177) is the donation and endowment for the Cloquer canon. The other records are ACV c. 6, 2417 (1172); 2408 (1172); 2513 (1188); 1973 (1190); 2571 (1194); and ACV c. 9, Pergamins del Bisbe Guillem de Tavertet, s/n (Nov. 22, 1195).

28. ACV, Liber Dotationum Antiquarum, f. 100v (1155); Arxiu Episcopal de Vic, Cartulari de l'Estany, f. 43v (1164); Arxiu de la Catedral de Barcelona (=ACB), 1-5-433 (1169); ACV, c. 6, 2424 (1173); ACB 1-5-425 (1175). I am grateful to Adam Kosto for the information about the Barcelona documents.

29. Freedman, *Diocese of Vic*, pp. 81-82, 88 (= *Tradició i regeneració*, pp. 132-134, 144-145).

The testimony of Pere *capellanus* affords additional information about the movement of the townsmen of Vic to create a local solidarity independent of the bishop's supervision. It supplements what was previously our only source for this incident, the judicial decision that described the movement as an effort to set up a consular regime. While, as previously stated, the townsmen themselves don't seem to have established officers that they called *consules*, the recollections of Pere describe an effort at self-government that can be viewed in the context of other (and often similarly abortive) urban political experiments in Catalonia and the Mediterranean.

Above all, the present document shows the significant role played by the king whose presence was ignored by the judges in the case and so previously invisible to us. Clearly in this case the king did not instigate the establishment of urban autonomy.³⁰ On the other hand, he was initially at least quite willing to confirm the charter drawn up by the townsmen and did not see it as infringing on his position as guarantor of the royal peace. In the end King Alfons was prevailed upon by Bishop Pere to regard the collective oaths as subversive. There is no way of telling whether this change of heart was really due to the dispassionate inspection of earlier privileges, or to some material inducements, or a perception of the townsmen as undermining authority in general, rather than as useful representatives through whom royal power in matters such as taxation might be increased.

Pere's testimony does not directly tell us anything about the motivations of the townsmen. Their oaths were for their mutual protection but what induced them to launch this risky affair must still be derived from the report of the trial where they in effect acknowledged the bishop's accusations that they sought to impose their own judicial sanctions against perceived disorders and malefactors. What was not explicitly at issue was the formation of an entirely independent consular regime nor were commercial rights or claims explicitly invoked. One would give much to know what was in the document that the king was asked to confirm, but what the urban leaders seem to have hoped for at this point was not a set of specific privileges but to extricate themselves from the complex and probably ineffective government of a divided city and fading episcopal authority. In this sense the events reported by the witness Pere have a connection with the jurisdictional conflicts of the early thirteenth century, a period in which indirectly, out of such events as the Moncada-episcopal dispute, the townsmen achieved an ascendancy by less direct means than were attempted in 1181-1183.

30. Discussions over how much the abortive Catalan urban and consular regimes of the late-twelfth and early-thirteenth centuries owed to royal initiative are effectively summarized in Daileader, "The Vanishing Consulates," pp. 65-67.

APPENDIX

Vic, Arxiu Capitular, calaix 6, perg. 2875 (excerpt)

Postea uero dixit quod homines uille Uici pro maiori parte, sicut audiuit et pro certe asserit, fecerunt coniurationem inter se, ut se adinuicem iuuarent atque defenderent. In qua coniuratione exceperunt dominum regem et P. de Redorta qui tunc erat episcopus et Guillelmum R. et forte paucos alios nescit tamen quos. Et quia non exceperunt uniuersitatem clericorum ecclesie uiso sacramentali, sicut ipse testes uidit, episcopus ualde commotus fuit aduersus eos, unde quadam dominica indutus ad missam in altari Sancti Nicholai infra ecclesiam Sancti Petri expresse nominauit multos ex illis qui erant in sacramentali, iniungens eis et omnibus aliis quod se adinuicem a sacramento absoluerent et rumperent ex toto sacramentale, et nisi fecerent, deinde haberet eos pro suis baudatoribus et ecclesie. Ipsi uero hoc facere renuerunt immo IIIor ex illis nomine P. de Puteo, qui tunc erat baiulus regi, et Martinus Cuxeta et Berengarius de Olost et alius cuius nomen ignorat, pro se et aliis coniuratis ad dominum regem apud Perpenianum, sicut audiuit, euntes imptrauerunt coniurationem quam fecerant ab eo confirmari quod ipse rex fecit et signum suum in sacramentali apposuit. Et post aliquantulum temporis cum rex esset apud Uicum et rogasset instanter episcopum quod huiusmodi sacramentale non infringeret set aprobasset et episcopus concedere noluisset, indignatus est ualde et commotus aduersus episcopum et ecclesiam. Et post multa uerba qui inter ipsum et episcopum fuerit, uisis instrumentis ecclesie, destitit a iuuamine et fauore illorum hominum super sacramentali. Processu uero temporis episcopus constituit iudices qui dicerent auctoritate ipsius episcopi utrum stare deberet sacramentale uel non qui per sententiam illud penitus reprobauerunt et infregerunt. Et ita ad mandatum et districtionem eiusdem episcopi et ecclesie, ruptum fuit sacramentale. Interrogatus si uidit ipse rumpi sacramentale uel quod homines se a iuramento absoluerunt, dixit se non uidisse sed firmiter asserit ita fuisse et ita scit in ueritate. Dixit etiam quod sententia illa lata a dictis iudicibus fuit ipso uidente in scriptis redacta et est adhuc in ecclesia sicut credit. Interrogatus si fuit uocatus ad hoc in aliquo G. R. uel baiulus suus, dixit non. De tempore dixit se non recordari sed in diebus Petri de Redorta fuit factum.